UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,654	07/27/2004	Gary A. Deeter	018894-0113	4653
23524 FOLEY & LAR	7590 06/27/200 RDNER LLP	EXAMINER		
150 EAST GILL		MULLIS, JEFFREY C		
P.O. BOX 1497 MADISON, WI		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/710,654	DEETER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jeffrey C. Mullis	1796		

	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1796	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extraction date of the structure of	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			oaaoo
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: see FINAL rejection. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e:	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been conside	ered but does NOT place the applic	ation in condition for a	allowance
because:			
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Jeffrey C. Mullis/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1796	
	•		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that the amine of Emmons would largely remove the functionality of Emmons oligomer which is required by the claims and argues that this is so since the amine is in gross excess. Firstly the DP of the oligomer of patentees' example 7 is well over 20 and would therefore require 20 amino functionalities per chain even if the reaction went to completion. However note that Emmons discloses the residual amine titer is 61 % of the original charge. Also there are only 3.5 amido groups created per chain vs. a DP of greater than 20 and hence only a minority of the original functionality is destroyed via reaction with amine. With regard to applicants' position regarding applicants Markush group, the Examiner agrees that Markush groups "consisting of" are closed as is well settled in law. The examiner also agrees that the term "consisting of" narrows a claim (with respect to the term that the term "consisting of pertains) irregardless that comprising may appear elsewhere in the claim. Since applicants Markush group is closed applicants claims require that oligomer must contain epoxy, anhydride ester or carboxylic acid functioanlity since the requirements of the claims are closed. Open language such as "comprising would open the Markus group such that the oligomer need not contain the 4 named monomers at all but instead could contain unnamed monomers to meet the claim limitations. Applicants' term "consisting of" is not recited to apply to the oligomer and does not recite for instance that the oligomer "consists of" the recited monomers but rather the limiting language applies to the recited Markush group. If applicants believe that monomeric units other than those explicitly recited (including amide units, ethylene or acrylonitrile etc) they are free to amend their claims in a continuing case to recite that the oligomer consists of specific units and delete the term "obtained from" in line 3 of claim 1 and elsewhere as "obtained from" does not exclude subsequent aminolysis. At present however such an amendment would require further consideration. It is not the examiners' position that any motivation in Klier arises from Kliers intended uses. .